

Dear Committee:

Thank you all for your time and I hope you consider having an open mind while reading my testimony. I know there will be a lot of testimonies you all will go through today, so I will try to keep mine short and meaningful. These proposed bills, especially S.B. 1076 will have many unintended consequences. I am against them any most gun control measures. I am not going to write about all the injustices of these bills because many others will do that and I don't want to bore you in a repetitive manner.

Instead, I would like to cover the argument that gun owners don't want to "compromise". I have been hearing often the argument that people on the gun control side want to pass something and gun rights advocates need to compromise in order to have something pass. This is flawed ideology. I agree compromise is necessary in many areas of politics including: taxes, spending, education, ect. However, I don't agree that compromise should be used in regards to controlling people's rights.

Compromising 2nd Amendment rights is as dangerous as compromising any other rights guaranteed in the federal and state constitutions. If somebody raised a bill to limit what churches citizens could go to there would be an outcry. If somebody proposed what words were going to become illegal, there would be an outcry. Everybody who appreciates freedom should be against any gun control measures that will make the guns we own illegal. There should be no difference in defending one right vs. another.

Any gun rights proponent who doesn't want to repeal the unnecessary and ineffective CT gun control laws is already compromising. Therefore the argument that gun rights advocates don't want to compromise is null and void. Most gun rights supporters will not advocate repealing the many ineffective gun control laws. I am a legal gun owner of two AR 15 rifles. One was made before 1994 and one was made with newer, better, and safe technology after 1994. Due to nonsensical CT law, only the one made before 1994 can have an adjustable stock that accommodates shooters of different sizes. The one made after 1994 has an adjustable stock that has been pinned in place so it can't adjust and won't violate CT law. The one made before 1994 can legally have a bayonet lug. The one made after 1994 does not because of the CT law. I tried real hard to find a case of a CT bayoneting and couldn't find any. I tried to find anything linking an adjustable stock to crime and couldn't find any.

I believe the current CT assault weapons law is ineffective, ridiculous and should be repealed. I am one of the few gun owners that truly is not compromising because I want to repeal any ineffective gun control laws on the books. I am fine with leaving some current gun control laws on the books that are preventing crime, but I am in favor of repealing ones that are ineffective. I am not compromising even though most gun rights advocates are compromising. Saying gun rights advocates won't compromise is misleading.

Thank you for your time

Tim Rockefeller, North Branford